

Appln. No. 10/695,598
Amendment
Reply to Office Action dated September 27, 2005

Docket No. 789-65

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated September 27, 2005. This response is timely filed.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-13 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, objections were raised to the drawings. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

I. Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, an objection was raised to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, and in particular, the tubular-shaped component as set forth in claim 6. Replacement figures 3 and 4 are attached hereto, which show the tubular shape in a part-sectional cut-away portion. The drawings were also objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference numbers not mentioned in the description: "200" and "300". An appropriate amendment is made to the specification herein. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 1, the phrase "a tool base for mounting said tool base to the table" was asserted to be confusing. Claim 1 has been amended appropriately, and it is believed clear that it is the releasable securing means that are used for detachably mounting the tool base to the table, the releasable securing means being fixed in a pair of grooves connected to the tool base. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

The Office Action indicated that the claims appear to be allowable over the prior art, and will be allowable upon amendment to correct the issues with respect to 35 U.S.C. §112, second

{WP275018;1}

Appln. No. 10/695,598

Docket No. 789-65

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated September 27, 2005

paragraph. Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Date: 12/27/05

Respectfully submitted,



J. Rodman Steele, Jr.

Registration No. 25,931

Sarah E. Smith

Registration No. 50,488

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000

Docket No. 789-65

Appln. No. 10/695,598

Docket No. 789-65

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated September 27, 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheets include new versions of Figures 3 and 4, showing the tubular shape of the components in cut-away sectional views. No new matter is added.

Attachment: Two replacement sheets